



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

The Riddle of the Bacchae. The last stage of Euripides' Religious Views. By GILBERT NORWOOD. Manchester University Press, 1908. Pp. xix + 188.

Verrall's *Euripides the Rationalist* is the prototype of this book. After an introduction in which the author expresses the opinion that the poet's religion is the only problem with regard to him left unsolved, and gives the plan of the present volume, he proceeds to discuss the following topics in succeeding chapters: The attitude of Euripides toward the popular religion, traditional difficulties in the *Bacchae*, the palace-miracle, the part played by Dionysus in the *Bacchae*, Pentheus, new minor difficulties, the explanation, Euripides' opinion of the Bacchic deity and of his religion, objections to the new theory. Then follow four appendixes: Supposed parallels to the palace-miracle, the miracles in the second messenger's speech, Dr. Verrall's work on Euripides, bibliography of writings on Euripides. An index completes the volume.

The bibliography, printed alphabetically, is the most complete yet published, and will be valuable to all students of Euripides.

The new solution of the "riddle" is found in the chapters on "The Palace-Miracle," and "The Explanation." The Lydian Stranger (Dionysus) has been captured by the King's servants and imprisoned in the royal stables. A call from within is heard by the chorus and recognized by them as that of Dionysus. The chorus think that they hear an earthquake, claim to see the stone architrave starting asunder and the flame arising from Semele's tomb, and prostrate themselves in awe of these manifestations of the power of Dionysus. Dionysus comes out and tells the chorus what has happened inside, among other things that "he hath flung the dwelling to the ground and it hath fallen in *complete* ruin." "This is a lie, the palace does not fall down, cannot fall down, and is not believed to fall down by anyone, except the deluded Maenads" (chorus). What then is the explanation? Simply this: the chorus have been "hypnotized" by the Lydian enchanter and are so completely under his power that they imagine what they describe! The audience knows that the palace has not fallen, in fact it could not have fallen *completely* because Dionysus, Pentheus, and others afterward come out of the palace doors as if no obstruction had fallen in their way so as to prevent their exit in the perfectly normal manner. The marvelous fall of the palace by the might of Dionysus, which the audience expect according to the legend familiar to them, does not happen. It is a colossal "joke," yet "an object lesson in the history of religion, a searchlight directed full upon the mists of error." So the audience are expected to infer from the vain imaginings of the frenzied chorus and the lies of the Lydian Stranger that the poet would teach that there is no god Dionysus; he is as unreal as the fall of the palace, which did not occur at all.

The Lydian Stranger, who claims to be Dionysus, is explained to be a product of the Orient, "a foreign wizard skilled in spells," versed in that mysterious influence which we now call hypnotism, but designated as "magic" in earlier ages. Modern hypnotists would be interested in knowing the way in which the wizard of Lydia exercises his hypnotic influence. The sound of his voice, recognized immediately by the chorus, seems sufficient to put them under the spell instantaneously. The rapidity of the process and the apparent uniformity of susceptibility on the part of all the fifteen choreutae (all are equally affected) would cause admiration and despair to modern hypnotists. Is it possible now to advance a new argument for the study of Greek (at least of the *Bacchae* and Euripides), in order to discover the lost hypnotic art of the Wizard of Lydia? Who says that Greek is not practical and up-to-date!

But there is no desire to trifle with Norwood's interesting book, but only to show one of the possible sequences of his theory, if tenaciously followed up. And there are others. The most that he says about the religious views of Euripides will be accepted by most scholars. He exalts rather than depreciates the art of the poet, and wishes to be fair and judicial toward the views of those who differ with him. It is only when he is under the hypnotic influence of his new theory that he fails to enchant all. It may be said of him, as he himself says of Verrall about another matter: "Dr. Verrall is pushing subtlety too far." But his book should be read by all students of Euripides.

C. F. CASTLE

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

Studies in Greek Allegorical Interpretation. By ANNE BATES
HERSMAN. Chicago: The Blue Sky Press, 1906. Pp. 64.

This Chicago dissertation by Mrs. Hersman falls into two divisions. Part I gives a sketch of allegorical interpretation before Plutarch; Part II deals with Plutarch, more especially with his treatment of the Isis myth.

The author has apparently well digested the principal modern discussions of Greek allegorical interpretation and presents in Part I a most useful synopsis of the subject, referring to the chief ancient sources and giving a "partial list of works consulted" which will serve as an outline bibliography. It would be unfair to complain of incompleteness here, since the essay purports to be nothing but a sketch. Yet it is proper to say that the collection of materials is by no means exhaustive. Thus Aristotle deserves a fuller treatment; e. g., there is, I believe, no reference to his interesting interpretation of Homer's Okeanos, *Meteor.* A9. There are also certain significant aspects of Greek thought to which one might have desired some references though a full discussion would